

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 1,8, 17, and 22 have been amended, and claims 29-38 have been added. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-38 are currently under consideration. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable.

Amendment and cancellation of certain claims is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims as previously presented.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. According to the Office Action, the specification fails to fully describe shared diffusion regions and multi-finger gates. Applicant respectfully submits that these topics are well-known to those skilled in the relevant art.

With respect to shared diffusion regions, this topic is discussed in U.S. Patent No. 6,020,776 (e.g., at col. 5, ll. 55-67, and at col. 6, ll. 56-60). This topic is also discussed in *Principles of CMOS VLSI Design* by N. H. E. Weste et al. (e.g., at pp. 277-278) and *Digital Integrated Circuit Design* by K. Martin (e.g., at pp. 52-53).

With respect to multi-finger gates, this topic is discussed in U.S. Patent Nos. 5,789,791, 5,831,316, and 6,197,671 (e.g., as indicated by their respective titles). This topic is also discussed in “Global Modeling Approach to Pre-Matched Multifinger FET” by B.A. Cetiner et al.(e.g., as indicated by its title) and *Digital Integrated Circuits - A Design Prospective* by J. M. Rabaey et al. (e.g., at pp. 456-457.)

U.S. Patent No. 6,020,776, which is cited at paragraph 5 of the present specification, was submitted previously in an Information Disclosure Statement. The other references cited above are now being submitted in an Information Disclosure Statement.

The Examiner has the burden to show a lack of enablement (MPEP 2164.04) This requires analysis of factors related to “undue experimentation”, where “[i]t is improper to conclude that a disclosure is not enabling based on an analysis of only one the above factors while ignoring one or more of the others.” (MPEP 2164.01(a)) With respect to the above-cited rejection, this burden has not been satisfied. Applicant submits that the description “is sufficient to permit those skilled in the art to make and use the invention.” (MPEP 2164) “A patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art.” (MPEP 2164.01)

Additionally, claims 1, 8, 17, and 22 have been amended to clarify the structure of the claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that the above-cited rejection be withdrawn.

New Independent Claims

Claims 29-38 have been added to the application, including independent claims 29 and 35. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If it is determined that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **306812005500**. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: November 19, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert E. Scheid

Registration No.: 42,126
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105
(415) 268-6369